

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/600,434	PORTRAIT, PASCAL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R Paradiso	3721	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John R Paradiso. (3) _____.

(2) JOSEPH M. LEWINSKI. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 6/18/04

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 8, 10, 12, 16, 20

Identification of prior art discussed: DIETRICH, MONRIEF, KONTZ


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: SEE REVERSE

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

APPLICANT EXPLAINED THAT, REGARDING CLAIM 8, MONCHIEF DOES NOT
SHOW ^{"EACH SAID DIE BEING} ~~BEING~~ MOUNTED ON ROTATING WHEELS ^{"AS CLAIMED."} ADDITIONALLY,
MONCHIEF CLEARLY SHOWS IN FIG. 5 THAT (36) & (62) DO NOT
MESH TOGETHER. EXAMINER AGREED. A

REGARDING CLAIM 10, APPLICANT EXPLAINED THAT EVEN CONSIDERING
THE GROUPING OF DIETRICH AS BOTH GROUP AND SUBGROUP, DIETRICH
DOES NOT SHOW THE CHANNELS DIVERGE. EXAMINER AGREED.

REGARDING CLAIM 16, APPLICANT EXPLAINED THAT KONTZ DOES NOT
SHOW THE SUPPORT MEANS "MOVED IN A ... PARALLEL PLANE TO SAID
ELONGATE MEMBER."

APPLICANT WILL SUBMIT FORMAL AMENDMENTS.